



# BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

2030 Addison Street, Seventh Floor, Berkeley, CA 94704  
Telephone: (510) 843-6200 Facsimile: (510) 843-6203  
www.beyerlaw.com

June 8, 2004

Kimberley A. DiMino  
Trademark and Legal Administration Manager  
Intellectual Property Department  
IGT  
9295 Prototype Drive  
Reno, NV 89521-8986  
Address

3713  
41  
**RECEIVED**  
JUN 18 2004  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Re: U.S. Patent Application: **"Wireless Gaming Environment"**

Inventor(s): Richard E. Rowe, *et al.*

Application No.: 10/044,218

Your File No.: P-267 DIV

File Date: November 19, 2001

Our File No.: IGT1P032D1

Dear Kimberley:

Enclosed for your records is a copy of the Office Action we received for the above-referenced patent application. Please note that a response to this Office Action is due on *September 1, 2004*. Unless we hear from you to the contrary, we will prepare and file an appropriate response in due course.

If you have any questions with regard to this matter, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Very truly yours,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

*Tomika D. Thomas*  
Tomika D. Thomas, Patent Secretary to:  
DAVID P. OLYNICK

/tt

Enclosures



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/044,218

11/19/2001

Richard E. Rowe

IGTIP032D1/P-267DIV

9182

22434

7590

06/01/2004

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP  
P.O. BOX 778  
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778



EXAMINER

HOTALING, JOHN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3713

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP	
ATTY: <u>JKW</u>	ASSOC: <u>DPO</u>
ACTION: <u>RESPONSE</u>	
<u>TO OFF ACT</u>	
DUE DATES: <u>9/1/2004</u>	
DOCKETED: <u>6/3/04</u>	BY: <u>KRM</u>
DOCKET NO.: <u>IGTIP032D1US</u>	

7/6/4/04

RECEIVED

JUN 18 2004

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/044,218

Examiner

John M Hotelling

Applicant(s)

ROWE ET AL.

Art Unit

3713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**RECEIVED**

JUN 18 2004

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Priority*

1. If applicant desires priority under 35 U.S.C. 119 or 120 based upon a previously filed application, specific reference to the earlier filed application must be made in the instant application. For benefit claims under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121 or 365(c), the reference must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) of the applications. This should appear as the first sentence of the specification following the title, preferably as a separate paragraph unless it appears in an application data sheet. The status of nonprovisional parent application(s) (whether patented or abandoned) should also be included. If a parent application has become a patent, the expression "now Patent No. \_\_\_\_\_" should follow the filing date of the parent application. If a parent application has become abandoned, the expression "now abandoned" should follow the filing date of the parent application.

If the application is a utility or plant application filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) on or after November 29, 2000, the specific reference must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the actual filing date of the application or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. If the application is a utility or plant application which entered the national stage from an international application filed on or after November 29, 2000, after compliance with 35 U.S.C. 371, the specific reference must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the date on which the national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) or sixteen months from the filing date of the

prior application. See 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and (a)(5)(ii). This time period is not extendable and a failure to submit the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 119(e) and/or 120, where applicable, within this time period is considered a waiver of any benefit of such prior application(s) under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). A priority claim filed after the required time period may be accepted if it is accompanied by a grantable petition to accept an unintentionally delayed claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). The petition must be accompanied by (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 120 or 119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) to the prior application (unless previously submitted), (2) a surcharge under 37 CFR 1.17(t), and (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Director may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional. The petition should be addressed to: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

~~A person shall be entitled to a patent unless:~~

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dabrowski US Patent 6,253,119. Columns 3-8 disclose the instant application specifically the following: column 3 discloses the microprocessor, column 4 discloses the touch screen or a similar pointing device as used in connection with a graphical user interfaces in home computer applications, columns 5 and 6 discloses the input/output mechanisms, and that the script processing device can include a scanner which reads codes on pre-coded script, additionally the external device that the script dispensing device may be connected to is a hand held device such as a PDA (personnel digital assistant) or a home computer. Further, the hand held device, the script processing unit may communicate with an infrared communications port using a protocol that implements handshaking and multiplexing of multiple data streams. Column 8 discloses that the script dispenser could interface directly with the microprocessor, or the ~~functions of the script dispensing device could be performed by the microprocessor~~ itself. Further the script dispensing device can be housed in the gaming device. In other words, Dabrowski discloses a wireless hand held device that communicates with infrared technology that includes an integrated script reader. With respect to claim 2 a

Art Unit: 3713

memory for storing game transactions see columns 5 and 6. With respect to claim 4 see column 4:5-19 and that it is known for a PDA to use a touch screen. With respect to claim 5 see column 5:63-67. With respect to claim 7 see column 6:13-24. With respect to claims 8, 10, and 12 see column 6:25-44. With respect to claim 9, 11, 13, and 14 see columns 5:62-6:42 which disclose various types of gaming transactions. With respect to claim 15 Dabrowski is used in a casino. With respect to claims 16 and 18 through 25 please see above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dabrowski US Patent 6,253,119 as applied to claims 1 and 16 above and in further view of Angell et al US Patent 6,702,672. Dabrowski discloses all of the instant application without specifically disclosing that the memory is removable from the hand held device and that the game is assigned to a game service representative. Instead Dabrowski discloses that (5:50-62) that the hand held device has the advantage of increasing the functionality provided by the script dispensing device since data and functional selection can be performed using standard off the shelf intranet or other networking hardware and software. The above statement is adequate motivation to enable one of ordinary skill to find other hand held game machines and utilize the technology found. In the hand held

Art Unit: 3713

game machine of Angell there is disclosed the use of a removable memory such as a smart card see columns 1,2, and 4. Furthermore Angell teaches in 3:33-40 that a player that receives wireless gaming device from a game officiant who represents a gaming establishment or the "house". Wireless gaming device 20 is capable of receiving wager information as commands entered by the player and transmitting the received wager information along with identification information to receiver 30 by wireless transmission. The above statement by angel makes it seem like the game machine is in the care of the game officiant. Making a individual game service representative responsible for a hand held gaming machine before checking it out to a player seems like an obvious matter of choice with respect to operating a business. Therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art using the motivation supplied above to combine the reference to have a memory which is removable and that the game machine is assigned to the game officiant prior to being assigned to the game player.

#### ***Citation of Pertinent Prior Art***

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

~~-----Kelmer et al '917 discloses a hand held game machine with removable memory~~

Burns et al '957 discloses a gaming ticket method (ezpay)

Saunders et al '832 discloses a gaming ticket method (ezpay)

Luciano et al '775 discloses a gaming ticket method (ezpay)



**Conclusion**

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M Hotaling II whose telephone number is 703 305 0780. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teresa Walberg can be reached on (703) 308-1327. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JOHN M. HOTALING, II  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

May 26, 2004